



10f3
RECEIVED

APR 25 2003

4/30/03
TECH CENTER 1600/2900 W

DOCKET NO. AH0948Q

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:) Examiner: N. Levy
Shih et al) Date: April 17, 2003
Serial No.: 09/431,519) Group Art Unit: 1616
Filed: November 1, 1999) Atty. Docket No.: AH0948Q

For: IMPROVED GROWTH STIMULANT COMPOSITIONS

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.192

Pursuant to the telephone conference conducted with Supervisory Examiner Jose Dees on April 16, 2003, Applicants are re-submitting this Appeal Brief to clarify that Applicants wish to appeal amended claims 1-20.

This appeal is taken from the decision of the Primary Examiner mailed on October 23, 2002, in which claims of the subject application were finally rejected.

Applicants filed an Amendment after Final Rejection on February 2, 2001.

Applicants filed a Notice of Appeal with Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on December 10, 2002. Reversal of the Final Rejection and allowance of all the appealed claims in the case are respectfully solicited.

This Brief is being filed in triplicate. Applicants have previously paid the required \$320.00 Appeal Brief fee on February 14, 2003. Please charge any additional applicable fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-0365.

02/25/2003 CV0111 00000013 09431519

01 FC:1402

320.00 CH

1. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest in this appeal is Schering Corporation, assignee of the subject patent application by virtue of an assignment executed by the inventors.

2. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals or interferences, which will affect or be affected by a decision in this appeal.

3. Status of Claims

The application was originally filed with Claims 1-42. Claims 21-42 were withdrawn in response to the Restriction Requirement of March 17, 2000. An January 2, 2001 amendment to Claim 1 was made in a response to the Office Action which issued on July 14, 2000. No amendment was made in the July 9, 2001 response to the March 29, 2001 Office Action. A Final Office Action was issued on October 9, 2001. Applicants filed a CPA application on February 11, 2002 without amending the claims. Amendments to Claims 1, 11 and 12 were made in a June 18, 2002 response to an Office Action which issued on March 18, 2002. A Final Rejection issued on October 23, 2002 to which Applicants are filing this Appeal Brief. An Appeal Brief, along with an Amendment after Final Rejection, were both filed on February 14, 2003. An Advisory Action was issued on March 6, 2003, entering the Amendment. A follow-up communication was issued on March 19, 2003, questioning the timing of the Appeal Brief. In a telephone conference on April 16, 2003, Supervisory Examiner Jose Dees clarified that the timing of the Appeal Brief was right, however the claims on appeal needed to be clarified. In accordance with the Supervisory Examiner's advice, Applicants are re-submitting this Appeal Brief, stressing that the amended claims 1-20 (as amended on February 14, 2003) are the subject of this appeal.

4. Status of Amendments

The Examiner withdrew claims 21-42 from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Applicants' Amendment to Claim 1 on January 2, 2001 was acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action which issued on March 29, 2001. Applicants' amendment to Claims 1 and 11 on June 18, 2002, was acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action which issued on October 23, 2002. An Amendment to Claim 1 and an Appeal Brief were both filed on February 14, 2003 to adopt the Examiner's suggestion made on the October 23, 2002 Office Action and to remove issues from appeal. This amendment to Claim 1 was entered as indicated by the Advisory Action of March 6, 2003. Applicants believe the above-mentioned amendments to Claims 1, 11 and 12 were entered. The Appendix contains all of the amended Claims 1-20 that are on appeal.

5. Summary of the Invention

The claimed invention teaches and claims an anabolic implant dual formulation composition comprising: (i) an immediate-release first formulation consisting essentially of an anabolic agent, and (ii) a controlled-release second formulation comprising an anabolic agent and a controlled-release agent, wherein said immediate-release formulation and said controlled-release formulation cooperate to effect stimulation, and wherein said anabolic agent, which may be the same or different in each formulation, is selected from the group consisting of zeranol, estradiol, testosterone, salbutamol, progesterone, trenbolone acetate, and combinations thereof. See claim 1 as well as "Summary of the Invention" and "Description of the Invention." The invention is aimed at a dual formulation composition useful for stimulating increased growth in cattle, wherein one formulation is an immediate-release formution, and the second formulation is a controlled-release formulation. The controlled-release formulation of the claimed invention is a polymer matrix which is biocompatible. See page 7, lines 11-14. Appellants amended claim 1 to require that the immediate-release formulation consists essentially of an anabolic agent selected from the group consisting of

zeranol, estradiol, testosterone, salbutamol, progesterone, trenbolone acetate, and combinations thereof. Therefore, the immediate-release formulation cannot contain a controlled-release agent, a polymer matrix, or any other substance which would materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the immediate-release formulation. Inventive dual formulations useful in stimulating growth in cattle are listed on page 15, lines 11-22 as formulations G-J. The appealed claims all demonstrate the desired weight-gain effect of the instant anabolic dual-formulation composition on cattle as shown by the Examples and Test Results disclosed in the specification.

6. Issues

- 1 **Rejection under 35 USC § 102(b), or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a).** Whether amended claims 1-20, are anticipated under 35 USC §102(b), or, in the alternative, are obvious under 35 USC §103(a) by *Gresser et al?* Is the claimed composition clearly anticipated or obvious to one skilled in the art?
- 2 **Rejection under 35 USC § 102(b).** Whether amended claims 1-20, are anticipated under 35 USC §102(b) by *Lewis?* Is the claimed composition clearly anticipated to one skilled in the art?
- 3 **Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a).** Whether amended claims 1-20, are rendered obvious under 35 USC §103 by (a) *Lewis* and (b) *Lee et al?* Is the claimed composition clearly obvious to one skilled in the art?

7. Grouping of Claims

It is submitted that the patentability issues for amended claims 1-20 are similar. The claims therefore are considered to stand or fall together.

8. Argument

1. Rejection under 35 USC §102(b), or, in the alternative, 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner's View of Anticipation and Obviousness is erroneous in the instant case

Anticipation

On pages 2-3 of the Final Rejection dated October 23, 2002, the Examiner contends that the *Gresser* reference demonstrates a formulation that consists essentially of an anabolic agent selected from the group consisting of zeronol, estradiol, testosterone, salbutamol, progesterone, trenbolone acetate, and combinations thereof. Appellants believe that the Examiner's rejections are based on generalized opinions rather than *prima facie* evidentiary statements that contain reasonings to support his statements. In fact, the Examiner fails to cite even a single line from either reference to support his conclusions. Appellants further believe that the rejections are based on flawed reading or interpretation of the cited references and, therefore, do not establish anticipation or obviousness as required by the law.

Gresser discloses a biodegradable polymeric multiphasic release system of one or more bursting units **wherein each bursting unit includes a bioactive agent encapsulated in a biodegradable, biocompatible polymeric membrane.** See Page 4, lines 23-26.

In contrast, the claimed invention, as stated above, is a **dual formulation composition** comprising an immediate-release first formulation consisting essentially of an anabolic agent and a controlled-release second formulation comprising an anabolic agent and a controlled-release agent formulation wherein the anabolic agent, which may be the same or different in each formulation, is selected from the group consisting of zeronol, estradiol, testosterone, salbutamol, progesterone, trenbolone acetate, and combinations thereof.

The transitional phrase "consisting essentially of" limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials or steps "and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristic(s) of the claimed invention. *In re Herz*, 537 F.2d 549, 551-

52, 190 USPQ 461, 463 (CCPA 1976). A significant difference between the controlled release formulation and the immediate-release formulation of the claimed invention is that the controlled-release formulation has a polymer matrix to control the release of the anabolic agent, and the immediate-release formulation does not have a polymer matrix to control the release of the anabolic agent. (See page 7 of specification). Because the immediate-release first formulation consists essentially of an anabolic agent, it cannot contain the polymer matrix of the controlled-release formulation in the claimed invention. To include the polymer matrix of the controlled-release formulation in the immediate-release formulation of the claimed invention would materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the immediate-release formulation, and therefore, materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the anabolic implant dual formulation composition of the claimed invention.

Similarly, because the immediate-release first formulation of the claimed invention consists essentially of an anabolic agent, it cannot contain a biodegradable, biocompatible polymeric membrane as *Gresser* would require.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Since the teachings of *Gresser* would require one skilled in the art to include a biodegradable, biocompatible polymeric membrane in the immediate-release formulation of the claimed invention, *Gresser* would require one skilled in the art to materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the immediate-release formulation, and thereby materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the anabolic implant dual formulation composition of the claimed invention. Thus, *Gresser* does not enable the invention.

Furthermore, *Gresser* does not disclose or suggest using an anabolic agent selected from the group consisting of zeranol, estradiol, testosterone, salbutamol, progesterone, trenbolone acetate, and combinations thereof, which is claimed in the claimed invention. Accordingly, the claimed invention is not anticipated by *Gresser*.

Obviousness

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or knowledge known to the skilled artisan, to modify the reference or combine the reference teachings. See MPEP 2143. The mere fact that references can be combined does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of doing so. See In Re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Another requirement for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention is that all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In Re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CPPA 1974).

As stated above, each and every element of the claimed invention is not disclosed in the *Gresser* reference. Furthermore, there is no suggestion or motivation in *Gresser*, and it is not known to one skilled in the art, to modify the invention disclosed in *Gresser* such that the skilled artisan would combine an immediate-release formulation with a controlled-release formulation as disclosed in the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Examiner has not met his burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and the claimed invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the *Gresser* reference.

Appellants strongly believe that the claimed invention is substantially and patentably distinct from *Gresser*. Appellants respectfully assert that there is simply no teaching in *Gresser* to motivate one skilled in the art to achieve the claimed invention, no matter how broadly one reads into *Gresser*. The claimed invention cannot be deemed unpatentable merely because, in a hindsight attempt to reconstruct the invention, one can find some of its pieces or elements in the art; it must be shown that the invention as a whole was obvious at the time the invention was made without knowledge of the claimed invention, 35 U.S.C. 103. Appellants believe that the Examiner has not met his burden of proving how a reading of the *Gresser* reference makes the claimed invention obvious. Nor has the Examiner presented a convincing line of reasoning as to why a skilled artisan would even be motivated to make the immediate-release formulation of the claimed invention, or to use the specific anabolic agents listed in the Markush group in the claimed invention.

In the Final Rejection dated October 23, 2002, the Examiner states that *Gresser* demonstrates a formulation consisting essentially of an anabolic agent in

the absence of evidence to the contrary. The Examiner has used that argument to reject the amended claims. The Examiner is indulging in conjecture rather than providing any objective evidence for such a statement. This is a rejection based on anticipation, or, alternatively, obviousness and the Examiner has not cited any teaching to motivate the skilled artisan to come up with the dual formulation composition of the claimed invention other than stating without any evidence that Gresser demonstrates a formulation consisting essentially of an anabolic agent.

Thus, it is believed that the claimed invention is novel and non-obvious over Gresser.

2. Rejection under 35 USC §102(b)

The Examiner's View of Anticipation is erroneous in the instant case

On page 3 of the Final Rejection dated October 23, 2002, the Examiner contends that the *Lewis* reference anticipates the claimed invention because the claimed invention does not preclude non-active materials. Appellants believe that this rejection is based on flawed reading or interpretation of the cited references and, therefore, do not establish anticipation as required by the law.

Lewis discloses long-acting biodegradable microparticles which contain a growth promoter. See Column 3, lines 25-32. The microparticles are composed of a polymeric matrix material which must be biocompatible and biodegradable. See Column 3, lines 41-43, and Column 4, lines 3-5.

In contrast, the claimed invention, as stated above, is a dual formulation composition comprising an immediate-release first formulation consisting essentially of an anabolic agent and a controlled-release second formulation comprising an anabolic agent and a controlled-release agent formulation wherein the anabolic agent, which may be the same or different in each formulation, is selected from the group consisting of zeranol, estradiol, testosterone, salbutamol, progesterone, trenbolone acetate, and combinations thereof.

Because the immediate-release first formulation of the claimed invention consists essentially of an anabolic agent, it cannot contain a biodegradable, biocompatible polymeric material as the teachings of *Lewis* would require one skilled in the art to do. To include the biodegradable, biocompatible polymeric material in the immediate-release formulation of the claimed invention, as *Lewis* would require one skilled in the art to do, would materially affect the basic and novel characteristics

of the immediate-release formulation, and therefore, materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the anabolic implant dual formulation composition of the claimed invention. Accordingly, each and every element of the claimed invention is not disclosed in the *Lewis* reference, and therefore, *Lewis* does not anticipate the claims of the present invention.

Appellants strongly believe that the claimed invention is substantially and patentably distinct from *Lewis*. Appellants respectfully assert that there is simply no teaching in *Lewis* to motivate one skilled in the art to achieve the claimed invention, no matter how broadly one reads into *Lewis*. Appellants believe that the Examiner has not met his burden of proving how a reading of the *Lewis* reference makes the claimed invention anticipated. Nor has the Examiner presented a convincing line of reasoning as to why a skilled artisan would even be motivated to make the immediate-release formulation of the claimed invention.

In the Final Rejection dated October 23, 2002, the Examiner states that the claim language does not preclude adjuvant and other non-active materials. The Examiner has used that argument to reject the amended claims. The Examiner is indulging in conjecture rather than providing any objective evidence how each and every element of the claimed invention is disclosed or suggested in the *Lewis* reference. This is a rejection based on anticipation and the Examiner has not cited any teaching to motivate the skilled artisan to come up with dual formulation composition of the claimed invention other than stating without any evidence that the claim language does not preclude adjuvant and other non active materials.

Thus, it is believed that the claimed invention is novel over *Lewis*.

3. Rejection under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner's View of Obviousness is erroneous in the instant case

On page 3 of the Final Rejection dated October 23, 2002, the Examiner contends that the *Lewis* and *Lee* references renders the claimed invention obvious because the first formulation of the claimed invention does not preclude non-active material. Appellants believe that the rejections are based on flawed reading or interpretation of the cited references and, therefore, does not render the claimed invention obvious.

As discussed above, *Lewis* (the primary reference) does not suggest or

discloses the dual formulation of the claimed invention. *Lee* (the secondary reference) discloses coating formulations for coating sustained-release drug implants. See Column 6, lines 25-26. The coating formulations of *Lee* are capable of forming a porous film over a biologically active agent at a constant rate over a prolonged period of time. See Column 6, lines 26-29.

In contrast, the claimed invention, as stated above, is a dual formulation composition comprising an immediate-release first formulation consisting essentially of an anabolic agent and a controlled-release second formulation comprising an anabolic agent and a controlled-release agent formulation wherein the anabolic agent, which may be the same or different in each formulation, is selected from the group consisting of zeranol, estradiol, testosterone, salbutamol, progesterone, trenbolone acetate, and combinations thereof.

Lee does nothing to correct the deficiencies of *Lewis*. Because the immediate-release first formulation of the claimed invention consists essentially of an anabolic agent, it cannot contain the formulation disclosed in *Lee*. The teachings of *Lee* would require one skilled in the art to include a formulation capable of forming a porous film over a biologically active agent at a constant rate over a prolonged period of time in the immediate-release formulation of the claimed invention. Therefore, the teachings of *Lee* would require one skilled in the art to materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the immediate-release formulation, and thereby materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the anabolic implant dual formulation composition of the claimed invention.

The *Lee* and *Lewis* are both deficient in respect to the immediate-release formulation. The combination of these references actually teach away from the instant invention. Additionally, there is no suggestion or teaching in *Lee* to modify *Lewis* with the instantly taught materials. To assume there is such suggestion or teaching in *Lee* is not allowed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Nor is there a reasonable expectation of success in *Lee* that the Examiner's proposed modification to *Lewis* would succeed. Both the suggestion and the expectation of success must be founded in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure. *In re Dow Che. Co. v American Cyanamid Co.*, 837 F.2d 469, 473 (Fed Cir. 1988). *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1208 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Appellants respectfully assert that there is simply no teaching in the cited

references to motivate one skilled in the art to achieve the claimed invention, no matter how broadly one reads into the two references. The claimed invention cannot be deemed unpatentable merely because, in a hindsight attempt to reconstruct the invention, one can find some of its pieces or elements in the art; it must be shown that the invention as a whole was obvious at the time the claimed invention was made without knowledge of the claimed invention, 35 U.S.C. 103. Appellants believe that the Examiner has not met his burden of proving how a reading of the cited references makes the claimed invention obvious. Nor has the Examiner presented a convincing line of reasoning as to why the skilled artisan would even be motivated to combine the two references, given the emphasis on the immediate-release formulation in the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Examiner has not met his burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and the claimed invention is not rendered obvious by the *Lee* and *Lewis* references either alone, or in combination.

On page 3 of the Final Rejection dated October 23, 2002, the Examiner states that the absence of "consisting of" in the first immediate-release formulation is seen as inclusive of non-active components. The Examiner has used that argument to reject the amended claims. The Examiner's reasoning is flawed since the "consisting of" language in the claimed invention precludes one skilled in the art to use the teachings of *Lee* and *Lewis* to make the claimed invention. As stated above, the teachings of *Lee* and *Lewis* each would require one skilled in the art to materially affect the *basic* and *novel* characteristics of the claimed invention. The Examiner is indulging in conjecture rather than providing any objective evidence how each and every element of the claimed invention is disclosed or suggested in the *Lewis* and *Lee* references, either alone, or in combination. This is a rejection based on obviousness and the Examiner has not cited any teaching to motivate the skilled artisan to come up with dual formulation composition of the claimed invention other than stating without any evidence that the absence of "consisting of" in the first immediate-release formulation is seen as inclusive of non-active components. Thus, it is believed that the claimed invention is patentable over *Lee* and *Lewis*.

In the absence of any reasonable basis to make out a rejection based on anticipation, or, in the alternative, a *prima facie* case for obviousness, reversal of the improper final rejection of appellant's amended claims 1-20 is appropriate, and such

action is respectfully solicited. Amended claims 1-20 are presented in the Appendix as Paragraph 9.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert L. Bernstein
Robert L. Bernstein
Reg. No. 46,020
Attorney for Appellants
Tel: 908-298-3985
Fax: 908-298-5388

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the foregoing correspondence entitled APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.192 is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on April 17, 2003.

Robert L. Bernstein

Robert L. Bernstein
Registration No. 46,020

4/17/03

Date of Signature

9. APPENDIX - CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. An anabolic implant dual formulation composition comprising: (i) an immediate-release first formulation comprising consisting essentially of an anabolic agent, and (ii) a controlled-release second formulation comprising an anabolic agent and a controlled-release agent, wherein said immediate-release formulation and said controlled-release formulation cooperate to effect stimulation, and wherein said anabolic agent, which may be the same or different in each formulation, is selected from the group consisting of zeranol, estradiol, testosterone, salbutamol, progesterone, trenbolone acetate, and combinations thereof.

2. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said immediate-release formulation and said controlled-release formulation are present respectively in a weight ratio range 1:2 to 1:25 in said composition.

3. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said immediate-release formulation and said controlled-release formulation are present respectively in a weight ratio range 1:2 to 1:10 in said composition.

4. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said immediate-release formulation and said controlled-release formulation are present respectively in a weight ratio range 1:3 to 1:8 in said composition.

5. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said composition is subcutaneously injectable in said cattle.

6. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said immediate-release formulation and said controlled-release formulation contain the same anabolic agent.

7. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said immediate-release formulation and said controlled-release formulation contain different anabolic agents.

8. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said anabolic agent is selected from the group consisting of zeranol, estradiol, estradiol benzoate, trenbolone, trenbolone acetate, somatotrophin, testosterone, testosterone propionate, salbutamol, progesterone, and combinations, salts and derivatives thereof.

9. The implant composition of claim 8, wherein said anabolic agent is zeranol.

10. The implant composition of claim 8, wherein said anabolic agent is trenbolone acetate.

11. The implant composition of claim 9, wherein said zeranol is the anabolic agent in both said immediate-release formulation and said controlled-release formulation and comprises from about 50 wt.% to about 95 wt.% of said composition based on the total weight of said implant composition.
12. The implant composition of claim 9, wherein said zeranol is the anabolic agent in both said immediate-release formulation and said controlled-release formulation and comprises from about 60 wt.% to about 80 wt.% of said composition based on the total weight of said implant composition.
13. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said immediate-release formulation additionally contains a diluent.
14. The implant composition of claim 13, wherein said diluent is selected from the group consisting of lactose, mannitol, sorbitol, sucrose, dextrose, starches, hydrolyzed starches, and combinations thereof.
15. The implant composition of claim 14, wherein said diluent is lactose.
16. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said controlled-release agent is selected from the group consisting of poly(D,L-lactide-co-glycolide), ethyl cellulose, methyl acrylate-methyl methacrylate copolymer, methyl cellulose, hydroxyethyl cellulose, hydroxypropylmethyl cellulose, sodium carboxymethyl cellulose, and combinations thereof.
17. The implant composition of claim 16, wherein said controlled-release agent is poly(D,L-lactide-co-glycolide).
18. The implant composition of claim 16, wherein said controlled-release agent is ethyl cellulose.
19. The implant composition of claim 1, wherein said controlled-release agent comprises from about 1.0 wt.% to about 8.0 wt.% based on the total weight of said implant composition.
20. The implant composition of claim 1, further comprising a bulking agent, binder, excipient, tabletting agent, colorant and combinations thereof.

RECEIVED

APR 29 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2000

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → Approved for use through 09/30/2000, OMB 0651-0034
Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OMB Control Number 1600-0001

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

		Application Number	09/431,519
		Filing Date	November 1, 1999
		First Named Inventor	Shih et al.
		Group Art Unit	1616
		Examiner Name	N. Levy
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	43	Attorney Docket Number	AH0948Q

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition Routing Slip (PTO/SB/69) and Accompanying Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Additional Enclosure(s) (please identify below)
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Statement	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		
Remarks		
Postcard		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	Robert L. Bernstein
Signature	
Date	April 17, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on this date: April 17, 2003

Typed or printed name Robert L. Bernstein, Reg. No. 46,020

Signature Date April 17, 2003

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.